



ERIC GIBSON
DIRECTOR

County of San Diego

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND LAND USE

5201 RUFFIN ROAD, SUITE B, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92123-1666
INFORMATION (858) 694-2960
TOLL FREE (800) 411-0017
www.sdcountry.ca.gov/dplu

July 26, 2010

CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form (Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G Rev. 10/04)

1. Title; Project Numbers; Environmental Log Number:

TM5560/GPA09-005/REZ09-001/ER 04-09-011A; McDonald Major Subdivision
for 15 lots.

2. Lead agency name and address:
County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B,
San Diego, CA 92123-1666

3. a. Contact Beth Ehsan, Project Manager
b. Phone number: (858) 694-3103
c. E-mail: Beth.Ehsan@sdcounty.ca.gov.

4. Project location:

The project site is located at 1666 Hanson Lane near the intersection of School
Daze Lane in the Ramona Community Plan area of an unincorporated area of
the County of San Diego; APN 282-341-38-42, 45, 46, 48

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1172, Grid F/1

5. Project Applicant name and address:

Jean F. McDonald, 1212 H. Street, # 175, Ramona, CA 92065

6. General Plan Designation
Community Plan: Ramona
Land Use Designation: 1 (Residential)
Density: 1 du/acre
7. Zoning
Use Regulation: A-70 (Limited Agricultural)
Minimum Lot Size: 1 acre
Special Area Regulation: Por (F)

8. Description of project:

The project site is located at 1666 Hanson Lane near the intersection of Glae Jean Court in the Ramona Community Plan area of an unincorporated area of the County of San Diego. The project is a Tentative Map, General Plan Amendment and Rezone to subdivide a portion of a previously approved project (TM 5378). TM 5378 was approved for an 11 lot residential subdivision, and the newly proposed TM would further subdivide lots 1-5, 8, 9 and 11 increasing the overall number of parcels from 11 to 18 within the area covered by TM 5378. Lots 6, 7 and 10 of TM 5378 are not part of this TM permit application. In order to achieve a higher density to allow for these additional lots, the applicant is requesting a General Plan Amendment and Rezone. The General Plan Amendment would change the existing (1) Residential to a (3) Residential. The rezone application would change the zoning from A-70 (Limited Agricultural) to RR-2 (Rural Residential), which would reduce the minimum lot size from 1 acre to 0.5 acre. A Plan Amendment Authorization was approved by DPLU in May 2008 to allow for the submittal of the General Plan Amendment based on conformance with the General Plan Update (draft land use map). The General Plan Update shows the area to be Village Residential (VR-2), which would be consistent in density with the proposed project. The zoning for the site includes a special designator of POR F (flood plain), however there is no flood plain on-site. The proposed lots would require municipal sewer and water service from the Ramona Municipal Water District. Earthwork will consist of cut and fill of 21,000 cubic yards of material. The project includes off-site improvements to Hanson Way. Proposed access would be provided by Glae Jean Court connecting to Hanson Lane and would include emergency access via proposed Wendy Marie Court to Hanson Way.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

Lands surrounding the project site are used for residential and educational uses. The topography of the project site and adjacent land is relatively flat with sloping lands along the southern boundary. The site is located within 1 mile of Highway 67 and within 2 miles of the Ramona Airport. The Ramona High School and

Olive Pierce Middle School are located within 0.5 mile to the northeast. The Ramona Community School is located approximately 0.5 mile to the northwest.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

<u>Permit Type/Action</u>	<u>Agency</u>
Final Map Modifications	County of San Diego
Grading Permit	County of San Diego
Improvement Plans	County of San Diego
Annexation to a City or Special District	Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
Air Quality Permit to Construct	Air Pollution Control District (APCD)
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit	RWQCB
General Construction Storm water Permit	RWQCB
Water District Approval	Ramona Municipal Water District
Sewer District Approval	Ramona Municipal Water (Sewer) District
Fire District Approval	Ramona Municipal Fire Districts

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project and involve at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or a "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| .. <u>Aesthetics</u> | .. <u>Agricultural Resources</u> | .. <u>Air Quality</u> |
| p <u>Biological Resources</u> | p <u>Cultural Resources</u> | .. <u>Geology & Soils</u> |
| .. <u>Hazards & Haz. Materials</u> | .. <u>Hydrology & Water Quality</u> | .. <u>Land Use & Planning</u> |
| .. <u>Mineral Resources</u> | .. <u>Noise</u> | .. <u>Population & Housing</u> |
| .. <u>Public Services</u> | .. <u>Recreation</u> | p <u>Transportation/Traffic</u> |
| .. <u>Utilities & Service Systems</u> | p <u>Mandatory Findings of Significance</u> | |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- .. On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

- b On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- " On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Signature

Date

Beth Ehsan

Land Use/Environmental Planner II

Printed Name

Title

INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative

declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

- a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
- a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

.. Potentially Significant Impact	.. Less than Significant Impact
.. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is located in a residential neighborhood in the Ramona Community Plan area. Based on a site visit by County staff Jarrett Ramaiya on February 27, 2009 the proposed project is not located near or within, or visible from, a scenic vista and will not substantially change the composition of an existing scenic vista in a way that would adversely alter the visual quality or character of the view. Therefore, the proposed project will not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista.

A vista is a view from a particular location or composite views along a roadway or trail. Scenic vistas often refer to views of natural lands, but may also be compositions of natural and developed areas, or even entirely of developed and unnatural areas, such as a scenic vista of a rural town and surrounding agricultural lands. What is scenic to one person may not be scenic to another, so the assessment of what constitutes a scenic vista must consider the perceptions of a variety of viewer groups.

The items that can be seen within a vista are visual resources. Adverse impacts to individual visual resources or the addition of structures or developed areas may or may not adversely affect the vista. Determining the level of impact to a scenic vista requires analyzing the changes to the vista as a whole and also to individual visual resources.

- b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on a site visit completed by Jarrett Ramaiya on February 27, 2009 the proposed project is not located near or visible within the composite viewshed of a State scenic highway. The site is located within a mile of Highway 67, which is considered to be a scenic travel route thru the Ramona community.

State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as scenic ([Caltrans - California Scenic Highway Program](#)). Generally, the area defined within a State scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist's line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The scenic highway corridor extends to the visual limits of the landscape abutting the scenic highway.

- c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surrounding can be characterized as residential.

The proposed project is a residential subdivision. The project is compatible with the existing visual environment's visual character and quality for the following reasons: the project is residential, within a residential area. Grading would included a balance of cut and fill with no soil import nor export.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on visual character or quality because the entire existing viewshed and a list of past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVII are located within the viewshed surrounding the project and will not contribute to a cumulative impact for the following reasons: the existing condition of the area includes residential uses, which are included in the proposed project. Therefore, the project will not result in any adverse project or cumulative level effect on visual character or quality on-site or in the surrounding area.

- d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes a major residential subdivision, which may include outdoor lighting. Any future outdoor lighting pursuant to this project shall be required to meet the requirements of the County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance (Section 6322-6326) and the Light Pollution Code (Section 59.101-59.115).

The project will not contribute to significant cumulative impacts on day or nighttime views because the project will conform to the Light Pollution Code. The Code was developed by the San Diego County Department of Planning and Land Use and Department of Public Works in cooperation with lighting engineers, astronomers, land use planners from San Diego Gas and Electric, Palomar and Mount Laguna observatories, and local community planning and sponsor groups to effectively address and minimize the impact of new sources light pollution on nighttime views. The standards in the Code are the result of this collaborative effort and establish an acceptable level for new lighting. Compliance with the Code is required prior to issuance of any building permit for any project. Mandatory compliance for all new building permits ensures that this project in combination with all past, present and future projects will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. Therefore, compliance with the Code ensures that the project will not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area, on a project or cumulative level.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Important Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site does not contain any agricultural resources, lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Therefore, no agricultural resources including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance will be converted to a non-agricultural use.

- b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is zoned A-70 (Limited Agricultural), which is considered to be an agricultural zone. However, the proposed project will not result in a conflict in zoning for agricultural use, because single-family residences are a permitted use in A-70 zones and will not create a conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use. Additionally, the project site's land is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, there will be no conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

- c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The area surrounding the project site within radius of 1 mile has lands designated as Farmlands of Local Importance. As a result, the proposed project was reviewed by Jarrett Ramaiya and was determined not to have significant adverse impacts related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance or active agricultural operations to a non-agricultural use for the following reasons: Active agricultural operations in the surrounding area are already interspersed with single family residential uses and schools and the proposed use would not significantly change the existing land uses in the area, resulting in a change that could convert agricultural operations to a non-agricultural use.]

Therefore, no potentially significant project or cumulative level conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Farmland of Local Importance to a non-agricultural use will occur as a result of this project.

III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes development with density levels that are less than densities anticipated in the SANDAG growth projections used in development of the RAQS and SIP. Operation of the project will result in emissions of ozone precursors that were considered as a part of the RAQS based on growth projections. As such, the proposed project is not expected to conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP. In addition, the operational emissions from the project are below the screening levels, and subsequently will not violate ambient air quality.

- b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes a major residential subdivision that would include a total of 15 lots, cut and fill of 21,000 cubic yards of soil with no import. However, grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal, temporary and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance. In addition, the vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 180 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the screening-level criteria established by the guidelines for criteria pollutants. As such, the project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

In general, air quality impacts from land use projects are the result of emissions from motor vehicles, and from short-term construction activities associated with such projects. The San Diego County Land Use Environment Group (LUEG) has established guidelines for determining significance which incorporate the Air Pollution Control District's (SDAPCD) established screening-level criteria for all new source review (NSR) in APCD Rule 20.2. These screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g. stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since APCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the use of the screening level for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for the Coachella Valley (which are more appropriate for the San Diego Air Basin) are used.

- c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions of PM₁₀, NO_x and VOCs from construction/grading activities, and also as the result of increase of traffic from project implementation. However, grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal, localized and

temporary resulting in PM₁₀ and VOC emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance. The vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 180 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance.

In addition, a list of past, present and future projects within the surrounding area were evaluated and none of these projects emit significant amounts of criteria pollutants. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. The proposed project as well as the past, present and future projects within the surrounding area, have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance, therefore, the construction and operational emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to create a cumulatively considerable impact nor a considerable net increase of PM₁₀, or any O₃ precursors.

San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour concentrations under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for Ozone (O₃). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM₁₀) under the CAAQS. O₃ is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM₁₀ in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The following sensitive receptors have been identified within a quarter-mile (the radius determined by the SCAQMD in which the dilution of pollutants is typically significant) of the proposed project: the Ramona Community School, Olive Pierce Middle School, and the Ramona High School. However, based on review by a DPLU staff air quality specialist, this project does not propose uses or activities that would result in exposure of these identified sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations and will not place sensitive receptors near carbon

monoxide hotspots. In addition, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations because the proposed project as well as the listed projects have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance.

Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12th Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. The County of San Diego also considers residences as sensitive receptors since they house children and the elderly.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project could produce objectionable odors, which would result from volatile organic compounds, ammonia, carbon dioxide, hydrogen sulfide, methane, alcohols, aldehydes, amines, carbonyls, esters, disulfides dust and endotoxins from the construction and operational phases. However, these substances, if present at all, would only be in trace amounts (less than 1 µg/m³). Subsequently, no significant air quality – odor impacts are expected to affect surrounding receptors. Moreover, the effects of objectionable odors are localized to the immediate surrounding area and will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable odor.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
p	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, and a site visit by Jarrett Ramaiya on February 27, 2009, staff biologist Beth Ehsan has determined that the site supports native vegetation, namely, non-native grassland. The previously approved project on the

same footprint, TM 5378, has already mitigated for the on-site non-native grassland by securing 3.8 acres of Coastal Sage Scrub/Chaparral Habitat in the Daley Ranch Conservation Bank on September 18, 2006. The additional area to be impacted by road improvements along Hanson Way is all disturbed and landscaped habitat, which does not require mitigation. In addition, the project will be conditioned not to grade or clear during the raptor breeding season, to avoid any impacts to nesting raptors or migratory birds. Therefore the impact is less than significant. In addition, there are no cumulatively considerable impacts because all of the projects in the area identified as containing non-native grassland have also been conditioned to provide mitigation at a 0.5:1 ratio, which is consistent with the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance, set up to mitigate for direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to sensitive habitats and the species that use them.

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	b	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:

Based on a site visit conducted by County staff Jarrett Ramaiya on February 27, 2009, and as supported by the Negative Declaration prepared for TM 5378 dated November 3, 2005, County staff biologist Beth Ehsan has determined that there is no riparian habitat within the impact area; however, the proposed project site does contain 7.5 acres of non-native grassland. The previously approved project on the same footprint, TM 5378, has already mitigated for the non-native grassland by securing 3.8 acres of Coastal Sage Scrub/Chaparral Habitat in the Daley Ranch Conservation Bank on September 18, 2006. The additional area to be impacted by road improvements along Hanson Way is all disturbed and landscaped habitat, which is not a sensitive natural community. Therefore, project impacts to any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community identified in the County of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance, Natural Community Conservation Plan, Fish and Game Code, Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, or any other local or regional plans, policies or regulations, are considered less than significant. In addition, there are no cumulatively considerable impacts because all of the projects in the area identified as containing non-native grassland have also been conditioned to provide mitigation at a 0.5:1 ratio, which is consistent with the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance, set up to mitigate for direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to sensitive habitats and the species that use them.

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on a site visit conducted by County staff, Jarrett Ramaiya, on February 27, 2009, and as supported by the Negative Declaration prepared for TM 5378 dated November 3, 2005, staff has determined that the proposed project site does not contain any wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, stream, lake, river or water of the U.S., that could potentially be impacted through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, diversion or obstruction by the proposed development. Therefore, no impacts will occur to wetlands defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers.

- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
p	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, and a site visit by Jarrett Ramaiya on February 27, 2009, staff biologist Beth Ehsan has determined that the site has limited biological value and impedence of the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, the use of an established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors. The trees on-site could potentially be used for raptor or migratory bird nesting; therefore, the project will be conditioned to avoid clearing and grading during the avian breeding season.

- e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact | p | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | .. | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Refer to the attached Ordinance Compliance Checklist for further information on consistency with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan, including, Habitat Management Plans (HMP), Special Area Management Plans (SAMP), or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources including the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), Habitat Loss Permit (HLP).

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact | .. | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | p | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Gail Wright on January 13, 2004, it has been determined that there are no impacts to historical resources because they do not occur within the project site, although a 1936 stone house is located on the adjacent parcel. The results of the survey are provided in a cultural resources report (prepared for an earlier project on the same parcel) titled, *Cultural Resources Survey Report for: TPM 20792, Log No. 03-09-035 – McDonald Minor Subdivision APN 282-341-17 Negative Findings*, by Gail Wright, Staff Archaeologist dated January 13, 2004.

- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact | p | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | .. | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Gail Wright on January 13, 2004, it has been determined that the project site does not appear to contain any surface evidence of archaeological resources either prehistoric or historic. The results of the survey are provided in an archaeological survey report (prepared for an earlier project on the same parcel) titled, *Cultural Resources Survey Report for: TPM 20792, Log No. 03-09-035 – McDonald Minor Subdivision APN 282-341-17 Negative Findings* by Gail Wright, Staff Archaeologist dated January 13, 2004. In addition, the project must comply with the San Diego County Grading, Clearing, and Watercourse Ordinance (§87.101-87.804), CEQA §15064.5(d), and §7050.5 of the Health & Safety Code. Section 87.429 of the Grading, Clearance, and Watercourse Ordinance requires the suspension of grading operations when human remains or Native American artifacts are encountered.

For consultation purposed, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted for a listing of Native American Tribes whose ancestral lands may be impacted by the project. The tribes listed by the NAHC were received 2/25/2009 and letters requesting tribal consultation were sent out 3/18/2009. Tribes contacted did not respond. However, the same tribes will also be notified when the project goes out for public review which will give the tribes another opportunity to comment.

Grading monitoring, consisting of a County-approved archaeologist and Native American observer, will be a required condition of project approval because of the proximity of known archaeological sites within a mile of the project, potential for historic era subsurface deposits and because of the proposed amount of grading (approximately 21, 000 cubic yards).

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?

.. Potentially Significant Impact	.. Less than Significant Impact
.. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

San Diego County has a variety of geologic environments and geologic processes which generally occur in other parts of the state, country, and the world. However, some features stand out as being unique in one way or another within the boundaries of the County.

No Impact: The site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been listed in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Unique Geology Resources nor does the site support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features.

d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
p	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps and data on San Diego County's geologic formations indicates that the project is located on geological formations that potentially contain unique paleontological resources. Excavating into undisturbed ground beneath the soil horizons may cause a significant impact if unique paleontological resources are encountered. Since an impact to paleontological resources does not typically occur until the resource is disturbed, monitoring during excavation is the essential measure to mitigate potentially significant impacts to unique paleontological resources to a level below significance.

The project has low to marginal potential for containing paleontological resources and will excavate the substratum and/or bedrock below the soil horizons.

A monitoring program implemented by the excavation/grading contractor will be required. Equipment operators and others involved in the excavation should watch for fossils during the normal course of their duties. In accordance with the Grading Ordinance, if a fossil or fossil assemblage of greater than twelve inches in any dimension is encountered during excavation, all excavation operations in the area where the fossil or fossil assemblage was found shall be suspended immediately, the County's Permit Compliance Coordinator shall be notified, and a Qualified Paleontologist shall be retained by the applicant to inspect the find to determine if it is significant. A Qualified Paleontologist is a person who has, to the satisfaction of the Planning and Land Use Director:

- A Ph.D. or M.S. or equivalent in paleontology or closely related field (e.g., sedimentary or stratigraphic geology, evolutionary biology, etc.);
- Demonstrated knowledge of southern California paleontology and geology; and
- Documented experience in professional paleontological procedures and techniques.

If the Qualified Paleontologist determines that the fossil or fossil assemblage is significant; a mitigation program involving salvage, cleaning, and curation of the fossil(s) and documentation shall be implemented. If no fossils or fossil assemblages of greater than 12 inches in any dimension are encountered during excavation, a "No Fossils Found" letter will be submitted to the County Department of Planning and Land Use identifying who conducted the monitoring and that no fossils were found. If one or more fossils or fossil assemblages are found, the Qualified Paleontologist shall prepare a report documenting the mitigation program, including field and laboratory methodology, location and the geologic and stratigraphic setting, list(s) of collected fossils and their

paleontological significance, descriptions of any analyses, conclusions, and references cited.

Therefore, with the implementation of the above project requirements during project grading operations, potential impacts to paleontological resources will be less than significant. Furthermore, the project will not result in a cumulative impact to paleontological resources because other projects that require grading in sensitive paleontological resource areas will be required to have the appropriate level of paleontological monitoring and resource recovery. In addition, other projects that propose any amount of significant grading would be subject to the requirements for paleontological monitoring as required pursuant to the County's Grading Ordinance. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant direct, indirect, or cumulatively significant loss of paleontological resources.

- e) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

.. Potentially Significant Impact	.. Less than Significant Impact
.. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	b No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Gail Wright on January 13, 2004, it has been determined that the project will not disturb any human remains because the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains. The results of the survey are provided in an archaeological survey report (prepared for an earlier project on the same parcel) titled, *Cultural Resources Survey Report for: TPM 20792, Log No. 03-09-035 – McDonald Minor Subdivision APN 282-341-17 Negative Findings* by Gail Wright, Staff Archaeologist dated January 13, 2004. In addition, the project must comply with the San Diego County Grading, Clearing, and Watercourse Ordinance (§87.101-87.804), CEQA §15064.5(d), and §7050.5 of the Health & Safety Code. Section 87.429 of the Grading, Clearance, and Watercourse Ordinance requires the suspension of grading operations when human remains or Native American artifacts are encountered.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
- i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?
Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known fault-rupture hazard zone as a result of this project.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. The County Code requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved before the issuance of a building permit. Therefore, compliance with the California Building Code and the County Code ensures the project will not result in a potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant: The project site is located within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. A Geotechnical Report prepared by Shepardson Engineering, Inc., on file with the Department of Planning and Land Use as Environmental Review Number 04-09-011A, has determined that the project on-site conditions do not have susceptibility to settlement and liquefaction. Therefore, there will be no potentially

significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure, including liquefaction.

iv. Landslides?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The site is located within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. Landslide Susceptibility Areas were developed based on landslide risk profiles included in the *Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, San Diego, CA* (URS, 2004). Landslide risk areas from this plan were based on data including steep slopes (greater than 25%); soil series data (SANDAG based on USGS 1970s series); soil-slip susceptibility from USGS; and Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to western portion of the County) developed by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (DMG). Also included within Landslide Susceptibility Areas are gabbroic soils on slopes steeper than 15% in grade because these soils are slide prone. A Geotechnical Report prepared by Shepardson Engineering, Inc. dated June 11, 2004 on file with the Department of Planning and Land Use as Environmental Review Number 04-09-011A has determined that the area does not show evidence of either pre-existing or potential conditions that could become unstable and result in landslides. Therefore, there will be no potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from adverse effects of landslides.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Placentia Sandy Loam (PeC) and Escondido Fine Sandy Loam (EsD2) that have a soil erodibility rating of severe as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. However, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil for the following reasons:

- The project will not result in unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and will not develop steep slopes.
- The project has prepared a Storm water Management Plan dated October 22, 2008, prepared by David Yeh of Landmark Consulting. The plan includes the following Best Management Practices to ensure sediment does not erode from the project site: silt fencing, desilting basin, fiber rolls, gravel bag berms, street sweeping and vacuuming, sandbag barrier, storm drain inlet protection, material delivery and storage, stockpile management, spill prevention and control, solid waste management, concrete waste management, stabilized construction entrance/exit, water conservation practices, dewatering operations, vehicle and equipment maintenance, any minor slopes created incidental to construction and not subject to a major or minor grading permit shall be protected by covering with plastic or tarp prior to a rain event, and shall have vegetative cover reestablished within 180 days of completion of the slope and prior to final building approval, preservation of significant trees, smart irrigation systems, infiltration trenches, downspout to swales, pitching pavement toward landscaping, stencils on storm drain inlets and catch basins ("No Dumping-Drains to Santa Maria Creek"), and the use of bio-retention swales.
- The project involves grading. However, the project is required to comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING). Compliance with these regulations minimizes the potential for water and wind erosion.

Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil on a project level.

In addition, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact because all the of past, present and future projects included on the list of projects that involve grading or land disturbance are required to follow the requirements of the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING); Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); and County Storm water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

- c) Will the project produce unstable geological conditions that will result in adverse impacts resulting from landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

.. Potentially Significant Impact

p Less than Significant Impact

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|-----------|
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | .. | No Impact |
|----|--|----|-----------|

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project will result in site disturbance and grading of 21,000 cubic yard of cut and fill soil. The proposed project is consistent with the geological formations underlying the site. For further information refer to VI Geology and Soils, Question a., i-iv listed above.

- d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact | p | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | .. | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is located on expansive soils as defined within Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). This was confirmed by staff review of the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. The soils on-site are Placentia sandy loam, 2 to 9 percent slopes, and Escondido very fine sandy loam, 9 to 15 percent slopes, eroded. However the project will not have any significant impacts because the project is required to comply the improvement requirements identified in the 1997 Uniform Building Code, Division III – Design Standard for Design of Slab-On-Ground Foundations to Resist the Effects of Expansive Soils and Compressible Soils, which ensure suitable structure safety in areas with expansive soils. Therefore, these soils will not create substantial risks to life or property.

- e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact | .. | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | p | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will rely on public water and sewer for the disposal of wastewater. A service availability letter dated April 16, 2009 has been received from the Ramona Municipal Water District (service area Santa Maria) indicating that the

facility has adequate capacity for the project's wastewater disposal needs. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

.. Potentially Significant Impact	.. Less than Significant Impact
.. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	b No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity. In addition, the project does not propose to demolish any existing structures onsite and therefore would not create a hazard related to the release of asbestos, lead based paint or other hazardous materials from demolition activities.

- b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

.. Potentially Significant Impact	.. Less than Significant Impact
.. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	b No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Although the project is located within one-quarter mile of existing schools, the project does not propose the handling, storage, or transport of hazardous materials. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

- c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

.. Potentially Significant Impact	.. Less than Significant Impact
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

- .. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated **p** No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on a site visit and regulatory database search, the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances. The project site is not included in any of the following lists or databases: the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5., the San Diego County Hazardous Materials Establishment database, the San Diego County DEH Site Assessment and Mitigation (SAM) Case Listing, the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program Database ("CalSites" Envirostor Database), the Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS) listing, the EPA's Superfund CERCLIS database or the EPA's National Priorities List (NPL). Additionally, the project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill, is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS), does not contain a leaking Underground Storage Tank, and is not located on a site with the potential for contamination from historic uses such as intensive agriculture, industrial uses, a gas station or vehicle repair shop. Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment.

- d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- .. Potentially Significant Impact **p** Less than Significant Impact
 .. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated .. No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:

The project is located within an identified Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Height Notification Layer related to the Ramona Airport, a public airport. It also lies within the Airport Influence Area of the Ramona Airport, a public airport which has an adopted airport land use plan. However, DPLU Airport Hazards staff specialist Tim Taylor has determined that the project does not lie within the identified safety zones of the Ramona Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan and is consistent with said plan.

Based on an application submitted by the project applicant, the FAA has conducted an aeronautical study under the provisions of 49 U.S.C., Section 44718 and Title 14 of the

Code of Federal Regulations, part 77. The study revealed that the project does not exceed obstruction standards and would not be a hazard to air navigation. The FAA issued a Determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation for the project on November 3, 2009. Therefore, the project complies with the Federal Aviation Administration Runway Approach Protection Standards (Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 77 – Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace).

Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

.. Potentially Significant Impact	.. Less than Significant Impact
.. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip. As a result, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

.. Potentially Significant Impact	p Less than Significant Impact
.. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	.. No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

The following sections summarize the project's consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

- i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a comprehensive emergency plan that defines responsibilities, establishes an emergency organization, defines lines of communications, and is designed to be part of the statewide Standardized Emergency Management System. The Operational Area Emergency Plan provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan includes an overview of the

risk assessment process, identifies hazards present in the jurisdiction, hazard profiles, and vulnerability assessments. The plan also identifies goals, objectives and actions for each jurisdiction in the County of San Diego, including all cities and the County unincorporated areas. The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.

ii. **SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN**

No Impact: The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan will not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project, plant and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated County and as such a project in the unincorporated area is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

iii. **OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT**

No Impact: The Oil Spill Contingency Element will not be interfered with because the project is not located along the coastal zone or coastline.

iv. **EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN**

No Impact: The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan will not be interfered with because the project does not propose altering major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct.

v. **DAM EVACUATION PLAN**

No Impact: The Dam Evacuation Plan will not be interfered with because the project is not located within a dam inundation zone.

- g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. However, the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the project will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Consolidated Fire Code for the 17 Fire Protection Districts in San Diego County and Appendix II-A, as adopted and amended by the local fire protection district. Implementation of these fire safety standards will occur during the Tentative Map, Final Map, or building permit process. Also, a Fire Service Availability Letter dated August 13, 2009, have been received from the Ramona Fire Department. The Ramona Fire Department requires 100 feet of clearing around all structures. The Fire Service Availability Letter indicates the expected emergency travel time to the project site to be 3.2 minutes. The Maximum Travel Time allowed pursuant to the County Public Facilities Element is 5 minutes. In addition, a short form Fire Protection Plan prepared for the project by Mark Brencick indicates that the project will include three fire hydrants, an emergency access road (Wendy Marie Court) and an access easement along Hanson Way. Therefore, based on the review of the project by County staff, through compliance with the Consolidated Fire Code and Appendix II-A and through compliance with the Ramona Fire Department's conditions, the project is not anticipated to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving hazardous wildland fires. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact, because all past, present and future projects in the surrounding area are required to comply with the Consolidated Fire Code and Appendix II-A.

- h) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

.. Potentially Significant Impact	.. Less than Significant Impact
.. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve or support uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural irrigation ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. Moreover, based on a site visit conducted by Jarrett Ramaiya on February 27, 2009 there are none of these uses on adjacent properties. Therefore, the project will not substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact | b | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | .. | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes a fifteen lot residential subdivision, which requires a NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activities. The project applicant has provided a copy of a Stormwater Management Plan which demonstrates that the project will comply with all requirements of the County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO). The project site proposes and will be required to implement the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: silt fencing, desilting basin, fiber rolls, gravel bag berms, street sweeping and vacuuming, sandbag barrier, storm drain inlet protection, material delivery and storage, stockpile management, spill prevention and control, solid waste management, concrete waste management, stabilized construction entrance/exit, water conservation practices, dewatering operations, vehicle and equipment maintenance, any minor slopes created incidental to construction and not subject to a major or minor grading permit shall be protected by covering with plastic or tarp prior to a rain event, and shall have vegetative cover reestablished within 180 days of completion of the slope and prior to final building approval, preservation of significant trees, smart irrigation systems, infiltration trenches, downspout to swales, pitching pavement toward landscaping, stencils on storm drain inlets and catch basins ("No Dumping-Drains to Santa Maria Creek"), and the use of bio-retention swales. These measures will enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. 2001-01), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).

Finally, the project's conformance to the waste discharge requirements listed above ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable water quality impacts related to waste discharge because, through the permit, the project will conform to Countywide watershed standards in the JURMP and SUSMP, derived from State regulation to address human health and water quality concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to water quality from waste discharges.

- b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	b	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project lies in the Ramona hydrologic subarea (905.41), within the San Dieguito hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, June 2007, a portion of this watershed at the Pacific Ocean and San Dieguito River is impaired for coliform bacteria. Constituents of concern in the San Dieguito watershed include coliform bacteria, nutrients, sediment, lowered dissolve oxygen, and trace metals.

The project proposes the following activities that are associated with these pollutants: construction/grading, sediments, nutrients, trash and debris, oxygen demanding substances, oil and grease, bacteria and viruses, and pesticides. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced in any runoff to the maximum extent practicable so as not to increase the level of these pollutants in receiving waters: silt fencing, desilting basin, fiber rolls, gravel bag berms, street sweeping and vacuuming, sandbag barrier, storm drain inlet protection, material delivery and storage, stockpile management, spill prevention and control, solid waste management, concrete waste management, stabilized construction entrance/exit, water conservation practices, dewatering operations, vehicle and equipment maintenance, any minor slopes created incidental to construction and not subject to a major or minor grading permit shall be protected by covering with plastic or tarp prior to a rain event, and shall have vegetative cover reestablished within 180 days of completion of the slope and prior to final building approval, preservation of significant trees, smart irrigation systems, infiltration trenches, downspout to swales, pitching pavement toward landscaping, stencils on storm drain inlets and catch basins ("No Dumping-Drains to Santa Maria Creek"), and the use of bio-retention swales.

The proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result the project will not contribute to a cumulative impact to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d). Regional surface water and storm water permitting regulation for County of San Diego, Incorporated Cities of San Diego County, and San Diego Unified Port District includes the following: Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); County

Storm water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). The stated purposes of these ordinances are to protect the health, safety and general welfare of the County of San Diego residents; to protect water resources and to improve water quality; to cause the use of management practices by the County and its citizens that will reduce the adverse effects of polluted runoff discharges on waters of the state; to secure benefits from the use of storm water as a resource; and to ensure the County is compliant with applicable state and federal laws. Ordinance No. 9424 (WPO) has discharge prohibitions, and requirements that vary depending on type of land use activity and location in the County. Ordinance No. 9426 is Appendix A of Ordinance No. 9424 (WPO) and sets out in more detail, by project category, what Dischargers must do to comply with the Ordinance and to receive permits for projects and activities that are subject to the Ordinance. Collectively, these regulations establish standards for projects to follow which intend to improve water quality from headwaters to the deltas of each watershed in the County. Each project subject to WPO is required to prepare a Storm water Management Plan that details a project's pollutant discharge contribution to a given watershed and propose BMPs or design measures to mitigate any impacts that may occur in the watershed.

- c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Regional Water Quality Control Board has designated water quality objectives for waters of the San Diego Region as outlined in Chapter 3 of the Water Quality Control Plan (Plan). The water quality objectives are necessary to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit as described in Chapter 2 of the Plan.

The project lies in the Ramona hydrologic subarea, within the San Dieguito hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential beneficial uses for inland surface waters, coastal waters, reservoirs and lakes, and ground water: municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; industrial process supply, industrial service supply; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; estuarine habitat; marine habitat; preservation of biological habitats of special significance; migration of aquatic organisms; and, rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat.

The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: construction/grading, sediments, nutrients, trash and debris, oxygen demanding

substances, oil and grease, bacteria and viruses, and pesticides. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable, such that the proposed project will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses: silt fencing, desilting basin, fiber rolls, gravel bag berms, street sweeping and vacuuming, sandbag barrier, storm drain inlet protection, material delivery and storage, stockpile management, spill prevention and control, solid waste management, concrete waste management, stabilized construction entrance/exit, water conservation practices, dewatering operations, vehicle and equipment maintenance, any minor slopes created incidental to construction and not subject to a major or minor grading permit shall be protected by covering with plastic or tarp prior to a rain event, and shall have vegetative cover reestablished within 180 days of completion of the slope and prior to final building approval, preservation of significant trees, smart irrigation systems, infiltration trenches, downspout to swales, pitching pavement toward landscaping, stencils on storm drain inlets and catch basins ("No Dumping-Drains to Santa Maria Creek"), and the use of bio-retention swales.

In addition, the proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water, storm water and groundwater planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses. Refer to Section VIII., Hydrology and Water Quality, Question b, for more information on regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process.

- d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will obtain its water supply from the Ramona Municipal Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported water source. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation, domestic or commercial demands. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge including, but not limited to the following: the project does not involve regional diversion of water to another groundwater basin; or diversion or channelization of a stream course or waterway with

impervious layers, such as concrete lining or culverts, for substantial distances (e.g. ¼ mile). These activities and operations can substantially affect rates of groundwater recharge. Therefore, no impact to groundwater resources is anticipated.

- e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes a 15-lot single family subdivision. As outlined in the Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP) dated August 24, 2009 and prepared by Landmark Consulting, the project will implement the following site design measures, source control, and/or treatment control BMP's to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: Bioretention swale and grass-lined bioswales. These measures will control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. 2001-01), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). The SWMP specifies and describes the implementation process of all BMP's that will address equipment operation and materials management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any onsite and downstream drainage swales. The Department of Public Works will ensure that the Plan is implemented as proposed. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in significantly increased erosion or sedimentation potential and will not alter any drainage patterns of the site or area on- or off-site. In addition, because erosion and sedimentation will be controlled within the boundaries of the project, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. For further information on soil erosion refer to VI., Geology and Soils, Question b.

- f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project will not significantly alter established drainage patterns or significantly increase the amount of runoff for the following reasons, based on a Drainage Study prepared by Landmark Consulting on April 9, 2009:

- a. Drainage will be conveyed to either natural drainage channels or approved drainage facilities.
- b. The project will not increase surface runoff exiting the project site equal to or greater than one cubic foot/second.

Therefore, the project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable alteration or a drainage pattern or increase in the rate or amount of runoff, because the project will not substantially increase water surface elevation or runoff exiting the site, as detailed above.

- g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project does not propose to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. Based on a Drainage Study prepared by Landmark Consulting on April 9, 2009, the proposed project will replace existing 18-inch RCP culvert and enlarge the existing box culvert crossing Hanson Lane to accommodate the on-site and off-site runoffs. Also, per project drainage study, the existing concrete ditch located on the northerly side of Hanson Lane is under capacity in pre-development and post-development conditions. However, since the overall peak discharge exiting the project site will decrease, the proposed development will not have any additional negative impact to the down stream storm drain systems.

- h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: construction/grading, sediments, nutrients, trash and debris, oxygen demanding substances, oil and grease, bacteria and viruses, and pesticides. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced in runoff to the maximum extent practicable: silt fencing, desilting basin, fiber rolls, gravel bag berms, street sweeping and vacuuming, sandbag barrier, storm drain inlet protection, material delivery and storage, stockpile management, spill prevention and control, solid waste management, concrete waste management, stabilized construction entrance/exit, water conservation practices, dewatering operations, vehicle and equipment maintenance, any minor slopes created incidental to construction and not subject to a major or minor grading permit shall be protected by covering with plastic or tarp prior to a rain event, and shall have vegetative cover reestablished within 180 days of completion of the slope and prior to final building approval, preservation of significant trees, smart irrigation systems, infiltration trenches, downspout to swales, pitching pavement toward landscaping, stencils on storm drain inlets and catch basins ("No Dumping-Drains to Santa Maria Creek"), and the use of bio-retention swales. Refer to VIII Hydrology and Water Quality Questions a, b, c, for further information.

- i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

.. Potentially Significant Impact	.. Less than Significant Impact
.. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	b No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No FEMA mapped floodplains, County-mapped floodplains or drainages with a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site [or off-site improvement locations]; therefore, no impact will occur.

- j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

.. Potentially Significant Impact	.. Less than Significant Impact
.. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	b No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No 100-year flood hazard areas were identified on the project site [or off-site improvement locations]; therefore, no impact will occur.

k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding?

.. Potentially Significant Impact	.. Less than Significant Impact
.. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site lies outside any identified special flood hazard area. Therefore, the project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.

l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

.. Potentially Significant Impact	.. Less than Significant Impact
.. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site lies outside a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County. In addition, the project is not located immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property. Therefore, the project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.

m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

.. Potentially Significant Impact	p Less than Significant Impact
.. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	.. No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

i. SEICHE

No Impact: The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir; therefore, could not be inundated by a seiche.

ii. TSUNAMI

No Impact: The project site is located more than a mile from the coast; therefore, in the event of a tsunami, would not be inundated.

iii. MUDFLOW

Less Than Significant Impact: Mudflow is type of landslide. The site is located within an area of mostly gentle slopes less than 25% in grade. However, there are areas of the site and to the south of the site with slopes greater than 25% in grade. The site is reportedly underlain by a thin layer of colluvium/residuum and bedrock and is vegetated. Based on the topography and geology of the site, mudflow from the slopes would not present a substantial risk to the planned building pad areas at the site. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project will expose people or property to inundation due to a mudflow.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| .. Potentially Significant Impact | .. Less than Significant Impact |
| .. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | p No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure such major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| .. Potentially Significant Impact | p Less than Significant Impact |
| .. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | .. No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element Policy 1.1 Current Urban Development Area (CUDA) and General Plan Land Use Designation (1) Residential. The General Plan requires minimum gross parcel sizes of 1, 2 or 4 acres (slope dependent category) and not more than 1 dwelling unit per acre. In order to achieve a higher density, the applicant is requesting a General Plan Amendment and Rezone. The General Plan Amendment would change the existing (1) Residential to a (3) Residential, which would increase the density to 2

dwelling units per gross acre. The rezone application would change the zoning from A-70 (Limited Agricultural) to RR-2 (Rural Residential), which would reduce the minimum lot size from 1 acre to 0.5 acre. The proposed density is consistent with the proposed General Plan land use designation, and the proposed lot size is consistent with the proposed zoning. A Plan Amendment Authorization was approved by DPLU in May 2008 to allow for the submittal of the General Plan Amendment based on conformance with the General Plan Update (draft land use map). The General Plan Update shows the area to be Village Residential (VR-2), which would be consistent in density with the proposed project. The proposed project was analyzed in relation to adjacent and nearby land uses, lot sizes and densities. Adjacent parcels to the north and northwest of the project site are already designated (3) Residential and zoned RR-2. In terms of neighborhood compatibility, the proposed lot sizes are similar to many in the surrounding area. There are a number of half acre lots west of the project along School Daze Lane and Ramona Street.

The proposed project generally conforms with the General Plan as detailed in the General Plan Amendment Report prepared by Landmark Consulting, dated December 21, 2009. The proposed project is consistent with the policies of the Ramona Community Plan as detailed in the General Plan Amendment Report prepared by Landmark Consulting, dated December 21, 2009. Although the proposed project fulfills the goals of the General Plan, it does not comply with the current Zoning Ordinance minimum lot size and General Plan land use designation; therefore a Rezone and General Plan Amendment have been applied for. Because the project is consistent with the CUDA regional category; parcel sizes, land uses and densities in the immediate area; and the proposed General Plan Update, staff recommends approval of the proposed project.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:

The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997) as an area of “Potential Mineral Resource Significance” (MRZ-3). However, the project site is surrounded by densely developed land uses including residential and civic uses which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to

neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, implementation of the project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value since the mineral resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	b	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is zoned A-70 (Limited Agricultural), which is not considered to be an Extractive Use Zone (S-82) nor does it have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25) (County Land Use Element, 2000). Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of locally important mineral resource recovery (extraction) site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan will occur as a result of this project.

XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	b	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:

The project is a 15-lot residential subdivision and will be occupied by residents. Based on a site visit completed by Jarrett Ramaiya on February 27, 2009 the surrounding area supports single family residences and is occupied by residents. The project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – Noise Element

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Policy 4b addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive areas to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level

(CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). Moreover, if the project is excess of CNEL 60 dB(A), modifications must be made to the project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or similar facilities where quiet is an important attribute. Project implementation is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial or other noise in excess of the CNEL 60 dB(A). This is based on staff's review of projected County noise contour maps (CNEL 60 dB(A) contours). Therefore, the project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element.

Ramona Community Plan

The County of San Diego General Plan, Ramona Community Plan, has a standard of CNEL 55 dB(A) for all projected noise contours near main circulation roadways, airports and other noise sources and requires mitigation if this level is exceeded. Project implementation is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial or other noise in excess of the CNEL 55 dB(A). This is based on staff's review of projected County noise contour maps (CNEL 55 dB(A) contours) and the presence of two rows of existing homes between Hanson Lane and the project site. In addition, lots 6 and 7 of TM 5378, which are located between Hanson Lane and the project site, are conditioned with a noise protection easement to provide noise attenuation barriers to meet County standards. Therefore, the project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Ramona Community Plan.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-404

Non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-404) at or beyond the project's property line. The site is zoned A-70 that has a one-hour average sound limit of 50 decibels daytime and 45 decibels overnight. The adjacent properties are zoned A-70 and RR-2 and have one-hour average sound limit of 50 decibels daytime and 45 decibels overnight. Based on review by staff the project's noise levels are not anticipated to impact adjoining properties or exceed County Noise Standards, which is 50 decibels daytime and 45 decibels overnight, because the project does not involve any noise producing equipment that would exceed applicable noise levels at the adjoining property line.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-410

The project will not generate construction noise that may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-410). Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36-410. Also, It is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM.

Finally, the project's conformance to the County of San Diego General Plan (Noise Element, Policy 4b and Ramona Community Plan) and County of San Diego Noise

Ordinance (Section 36-404 and 36.410) ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable noise impacts, because the project will not exceed the local noise standards for noise sensitive areas; and the project will not exceed the applicable noise level limits at the property line or construction noise limits, derived from State regulation to address human health and quality of life concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of persons or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, and applicable standards of other agencies.

- b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes a residential subdivision where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation and/or sleeping conditions. However, the facilities are setback 200 feet from any public road or transit Right-of-Way with projected noise contours of 65 dB or more; any property line for parcels zoned industrial or extractive use; or any permitted extractive uses. A setback of 200 feet ensures that the operations do not have any chance of being impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels (Harris, Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment* 1995). In addition, the setback ensures that the project will not be affected by any past, present or future projects that may support sources of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise.

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels and impact vibration sensitive uses in the surrounding area.

Therefore, the project will not expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on a project or cumulative level.

- c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:

The project involves the following permanent noise sources that may increase the ambient noise level: vehicles, residential air conditioning, music, etc. As indicated in the response listed under Section XI Noise, Question a., the project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control. Also, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels based on review of the project by County staff. Studies completed by the Organization of Industry Standards (ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747) state an increase of 10 dB is perceived as twice as loud and is perceived as a significant increase in the ambient noise level.

The project will not result in cumulatively noise impacts because a list of past, present and future projects within in the vicinity were evaluated. It was determined that the project in combination with a list of past, present and future project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

- d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project does not involve any uses that may create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity including but not limited to extractive industry; outdoor commercial or industrial uses that involve crushing, cutting, drilling, grinding, or blasting of raw materials; truck depots, transfer stations or delivery areas; or outdoor sound systems.

Also, general construction noise is not expected to exceed the construction noise limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-410), which are derived from State regulations to address human health and quality of life concerns. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36-410. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than an 8 hours during a 24-hour period. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport for the Ramona Airport. However, the project implementation is not expected to expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels in excess of the CNEL 60 dB(A). This is based on staff's review of projected County noise contour maps (CNEL 60 dB(A) contours). The location of the project is outside of the CNEL 60 dB(A) contours for the airport.

In addition, based on the list of past, present and future projects there are no new or expanded public airports projects in the vicinity that may extend the boundaries of the CNEL 60 dB noise contour or CLUP. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise on a project or cumulative level.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact | p | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | .. | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes a General Plan amendment from (1) Residential to (3) Residential, and rezone from A-70 (1 du/acre) to RR-2 (2 du/acre). However, this regulatory change will not induce substantial population growth in the area, because it will not require the extension of infrastructure and public facilities such as water, sewer or roadways into previously unserved areas. The project site is suitable for increased residential development because it is located in the Town Center, adjacent to schools, services, and the main commercial area. In addition, the proposed density conforms to the proposed General Plan Update.

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact | .. | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | p | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not displace existing housing since the site is currently vacant. The addition of 15 dwelling units will yield a net gain of available housing.

- c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact | .. | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | p | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people since the site is currently vacant.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause

significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- i. Fire protection?
- ii. Police protection?
- iii. Schools?
- iv. Parks?
- v. Other public facilities?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on the service availability forms received for the project, the proposed project will not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate existing services are available to the project from the following agencies/districts: Ramona Fire Department and Ramona Unified School District. The project does not involve the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including but not limited to fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, the project will not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed.

XIV. RECREATION

- a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project involves a residential subdivision that will increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. To avoid substantial physical deterioration of local recreation facilities the project will be required to pay fees or dedicate land for local parks to the County pursuant to the Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO). The Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) is the mechanism that enables the funding or dedication of local parkland in the County. The PLDO establishes several methods by which developers

may satisfy their park requirements. Options include the payment of park fees, the dedication of a public park, the provision of private recreational facilities, or a combination of these methods. PLDO funds must be used for the acquisition, planning, and development of local parkland and recreation facilities. Local parks are intended to serve the recreational needs of the communities in which they are located. The proposed project opted to pay the park fees. Therefore, the project meets the requirements set forth by the PLDO for adequate parkland dedication and thereby reducing impacts, including cumulative impacts to local recreational facilities. The project will not result in significant cumulative impacts, because all past, present and future residential projects are required to comply with the requirements of PLDO. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

With regard to regional recreational facilities, there are over 21,765 acres of regional parkland owned by the County, which exceeds the General Plan standard of 15 acres per 1,000 population. In addition, there are over one million acres of publicly owned land in San Diego County dedicated to parks or open space including Federal lands, State Parks, special districts, and regional river parks. Due to the extensive acreage of existing publicly owned lands that can be used for recreation, the project will not result in substantial physical deterioration of regional recreational facilities or accelerate the deterioration of regional parkland. Moreover, the project will not result in a cumulatively considerable deterioration or accelerated deterioration of regional recreation facilities because even with all past, present and future residential projects a significant amount of regional recreational facilities will be available to County residents.

- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

.. Potentially Significant Impact	.. Less than Significant Impact
.. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the construction or expansion of recreational facilities cannot have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

- a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant:

A Traffic Impact Study, dated April 29, 2009, prepared by LOS Engineering, Inc. on file with the Department of Planning and Land Use under Environmental Review Number 04-09-011A was completed for the proposed project. The Traffic Impact Study concluded that the proposed project will result in an additional 180 ADT. The addition of 180 ADT will not result in a potential degradation of the level of service of affected roadways in relation to the existing traffic volumes and road capacity pursuant to the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance.

DIRECT IMPACTS:

The proposed project will result in an additional 180 ADT. The project was reviewed by the Department of Public Works and was determined not to result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, volume of capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections in relation to existing conditions for the following reasons: The proposed project would not result in a degradation of the level of service (LOS) of affected roadways. Hanson Lane is a Collector Road on the San Diego County Circulation Element of the General Plan with a current LOS C (8,580 ADT) {threshold of 13,500 ADT for LOS D, based upon existing 3-lane road}. The traffic volume from the project (180 ADT) would not result in any impacts, degradation, or threshold increase on Hanson Lane. Therefore, the project will not have a significant direct project level impact increase in traffic, which is considered substantial in relation to existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.

The proposed project will result in an additional 180 ADT. The project was reviewed by the Department of Public Works and was determined not to result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, volume of capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections in relation to existing conditions for the following reasons: The proposed project would not result in a degradation of the level of service (LOS) of affected roadways. Ramona Street is a Rural Collector Road with Bike Lanes on the San Diego County Circulation Element of the General Plan with a current LOS D (8,908 ADT) {threshold of 10,900 ADT for LOS D, based upon existing 2-lane road}. The traffic volume from the project (180 ADT) would not result in any impacts, degradation, or threshold increase on Ramona Street. Therefore, the project will not have a significant direct project level impact increase in traffic, which is considered substantial in relation to existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.

The proposed project will result in an additional 180 ADT. The project was reviewed by the Department of Public Works and was determined not to result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, volume of capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections in relation to existing conditions for the following reasons: The proposed project would not result in a degradation of the level of service (LOS) of affected roadways. San Vicente Road is a Major Road with Bike Lanes on the San Diego County Circulation Element of the General Plan with a current LOS E for the segment south of Hanson Lane(13,616 ADT) and LOS D for the segment north of Hanson Lane (10,259 ADT) {threshold of 13,500 ADT for LOS D, based upon existing 3-lane road}. The traffic volume from the project (180 ADT) would not result in any impacts, degradation, or threshold increase on San Vicente Road. Therefore, the project will not have a significant direct project level impact increase in traffic, which is considered substantial in relation to existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.

- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency and/or as identified by the County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Program for designated roads or highways?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
p	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: A Traffic Impact Study, dated April 29, 2009, prepared by LOS Engineering, Inc. on file with the Department of Planning and Land Use under Environmental Review Number 04-09-011A was completed for the proposed project. The Traffic Impact Study concluded that the proposed project will result in an additional 180 ADT. The addition of 180 ADT will result in a cumulative potential degradation of the level of service of affected roadways in relation to the existing traffic volumes and road capacity pursuant to for the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance. The potential cumulative impacts are mitigated to less than significant with the following mitigation:

The County of San Diego has developed an overall programmatic solution that addresses existing and projected future road deficiencies in the unincorporated portion of San Diego County. This program includes the adoption of a Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to fund improvements to roadways necessary to mitigate potential cumulative impacts caused by traffic from future development. Based on SANDAG regional growth and land use forecasts, the SANDAG Regional Transportation Model was utilized to analyze projected build-out (year 2030) development conditions on the existing circulation element roadway network throughout the unincorporated area of the County. Based on the results of the traffic modeling, funding necessary to construct transportation facilities that will mitigate cumulative impacts from new development was

identified. Existing roadway deficiencies will be corrected through improvement projects funded by other public funding sources, such as TransNet, gas tax, and grants. Potential cumulative impacts to the region's freeways have been addressed in SANDAG's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This plan, which considers freeway buildout over the next 30 years, will use funds from TransNet, State, and Federal funding to improve freeways to projected level of service objectives in the RTP.

The proposed project generates 180 ADT. These trips will be distributed on circulation element roadways in the County that were analyzed by the TIF program, some of which currently or are projected to operate at inadequate levels of service. These project trips therefore contribute to a potential significant cumulative impact and mitigation is required. The potential growth represented by this project was included in the growth projections upon which the TIF program is based. Therefore, payment of the TIF, which will be required at issuance of building permits, in combination with other components of the program described above, will mitigate potential cumulative traffic impacts to less than significant.

- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	b	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project lies within an identified Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Height Notification Layer related to the Ramona Airport. The Federal Aviation Administration has conducted an aeronautical study of the project under the provisions of 49 U.S.C., Section 44718 and Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 77. This study revealed that the project does not exceed obstruction standards and would not be a hazard to air navigation. The FAA issued a Determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation for the project on November 3, 2009. Therefore, the project complies with the Federal Aviation Administration Runway Approach Protection Standards (Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 77 – Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace).

In addition, while the project is within the Airport Influence Area for the Ramona Airport, the project is consistent with the Ramona Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.

Therefore, the project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.

- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant: The proposed project will not significantly alter traffic safety on Hanson Lane. A safe and adequate sight distance of 380 feet looking east and 370 feet looking west along Hanson Lane shall be required at the intersection with Glae Jean Court to the satisfaction of the Director of the Department of Public Works. All road improvements will be constructed according to the County of San Diego Public and Private Road Standards. Roads used to access the proposed project site are up to County standards. The proposed project will not place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project will not result in inadequate emergency access. The Ramona Fire Department has reviewed the proposed project and associated emergency access roadways and has determined that there is adequate emergency fire access proposed. The project includes Wendy Marie Court, a 24 foot wide emergency access road in a 28 foot wide easement. Wendy Marie Court connects Glae Jean Court to Hanson Way, with an emergency vehicle gate per fire department specifications. An easement along Hanson Way connects to Hanson Lane. Additionally, roads used will be required to be improved to County standards.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Zoning Ordinance Section 6758 Parking Schedule requires two on-site parking spaces for each dwelling unit. The proposed lots

have sufficient area to provide at least two on-site parking spaces consistent with the Zoning Ordinance.

- g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant: The project does not propose any hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists, since no hazards or barriers are proposed. Based on a Traffic Impact Study, dated April 29, 2009, prepared by LOS Engineering, Inc. on file with the Department of Planning and Land Use under Environmental Review Number 04-09-011, any required improvements will be constructed to maintain existing conditions as it relates to pedestrians and bicyclists.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:

The project proposes to discharge domestic waste to a community sewer system that is permitted to operate by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). A project facility availability form has been received from the Ramona Municipal Water District that indicates the district will serve the project. Therefore, because the project will be discharging wastewater to a RWQCB permitted community sewer system and will be required to satisfy the conditions provided by the Ramona Municipal Water District, the project is consistent with the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB, including the Regional Basin Plan.

- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
----	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------

..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact
----	---	----	-----------

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:

Based on the service availability forms received for the project new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities are required. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate services are available to the project from the following agencies/districts: Ramona Municipal Water District. Pursuant to the service availability form, the following new wastewater treatment facilities must be constructed as a part of the project. The new facilities include connecting a new 8-inch sewer main to the existing 12-inch main on Hanson Lane. The new main would extend approximately 1,147 feet to the end of Glae Jean Court. However, as outlined in this Environmental Analysis Form Section I-XVII, the new facilities will not result in adverse physical effect on the environment.

- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:

The project involves new storm water drainage facilities. The new facilities include a grass-lined bio swale, culverts, catch basin and rip-rap. Refer to the Storm Water Management Plan dated August 24, 2009 for more information. However, as outlined in this Environmental Analysis Form Section I-XVII, the new facilities will not result in adverse physical effect on the environment.

- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project requires water service from the Ramona Municipal Water District. A Service Availability Letter from the Ramona Municipal Water

District has been provided, indicating adequate water resources and entitlements are available to serve the requested water resources, upon completion of water district conditions. Therefore, the project will have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project.

- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project requires wastewater service from the Ramona Municipal Water District. A Service Availability Letter and Sewer System Evaluation from the Water District has been provided, indicating adequate wastewater service capacity is available to serve the requested demand, upon completion of water district conditions. Therefore, the project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment provider's service capacity.

- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project will generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). There are five, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity. Therefore, there is sufficient existing permitted solid waste capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	b	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project will generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). The project will deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility and therefore, will comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	b	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects. There is no substantial evidence that there are biological or cultural resources that are affected or associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past

projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

- .. Potentially Significant Impact .. Less than Significant Impact
 p Less Than Significant With Mitigation .. No Impact
 Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

FOR ALL RESPONSES

The following list of past, present and future projects were considered and evaluated as a part of this Initial Study:

PROJECT NAME	PERMIT/MAP NUMBER
30 lots (MDS Dev Corp)	TM 4962
25 lots (Ramona Ridge Estates)	TM 5008
37 lots (Teyssier)	TM 5194
38 lots (Rancho Esquilago)	TM 5198
67 lots (Development Venture)	TM 5254
7 lots (Sunset Vista)	TM 5257
8 lots (Roberts)	TM 5267
67 lots (Elliot)	TM 5302
13 lots (Meadow Builders)	TM 5311
62 condominiums (Valley Park Condo's)	TM 5480
2 parcels (Ramona)	TPM 20466
5 parcels (McCandless)	TPM 20564
Huber	TPM 20650
5 parcels (Kvaas)	TPM 20747
1 parcel (?) (Edbell)	TPM 20900
4 parcels (Harman)	TPM 20907
2 parcels (Filippini)	TPM 20926
4 parcels (Neuman)	TPM 20962
3 parcels (Sptisbergen)	TPM 21042
3 parcels (Highland Valley)	TPM 21051
Montecito Ranch (417 lots)	
Ramona Air Center	
Kelley Ave – 11 unit (S06-009?)	

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XVI of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be

potentially significant cumulative effects related to traffic. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these cumulative effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes payment of the TIF. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are cumulative effects associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
p	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:

In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, VIII Hydrology and Water Quality XI. Noise, XII. Population and Housing, and XV. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant cumulative effects to human beings related to traffic. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes payment of the TIF. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are adverse effects to human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

XVIII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

All references to Federal, State and local regulation are available on the Internet. For Federal regulation refer to <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>. For State regulation refer to www.leginfo.ca.gov. For County regulation refer to www.amlegal.com. All other references are available upon request.

Yeh, David. Storm Water Management Plan for Priority Projects. August 24, 2009.

Yeh, David. Preliminary Drainage Report for Estates at McDonald. April 9, 2009.

LOS Engineering, Inc. Draft Traffic Impact Study. April 29, 2009.

Brencick, Mark. Fire Protection Plan. August 26, 2009.

Landmark Consulting. General Plan Amendment Report. August 26, 2009

Shepardson Engineering Associates Inc. Geotechnical Investigation. June 11, 2004 [included as Attachment 6 of the GPA Report]

AESTHETICS

California Street and Highways Code [California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283.
(<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/>)

California Scenic Highway Program, California Streets and Highways Code, Section 260-283.
(<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/scpr.htm>)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910, 6322-6326. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-73: Hillside Development Policy. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-104: Policy and Procedures for Preparation of Community Design Guidelines, Section 396.10 of the County Administrative Code and Section 5750 et seq. of the County Zoning Ordinance. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, General Plan, Scenic Highway Element VI and Scenic Highway Program. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Light Pollution Code, Title 5, Division 9 (Sections 59.101-59.115 of the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances) as added by Ordinance No 6900, effective January 18, 1985, and amended July 17, 1986 by Ordinance No. 7155. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Wireless Communications Ordinance [San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances. (www.amlegal.com)

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County. (Alpine, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Julian, Lakeside, Ramona, Spring Valley, Sweetwater, Valley Center).

Federal Communications Commission, Telecommunications Act of 1996 [Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. LA. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996). (<http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/tcom1996.txt>)

Institution of Lighting Engineers, Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution, Warwickshire, UK, 2000 (<http://www.dark-skies.org/ile-gd-e.htm>)

International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997. (www.intl-light.com)

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPPI), Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003. (www.lrc.rpi.edu)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000, Urbanized Area Outline Map, San Diego, CA. (<http://www.census.gov/geo/www/maps/ua2kmaps.htm>)

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System. (www.blm.gov)

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.

US Department of Transportation, National Highway System Act of 1995 [Title III, Section 304. Design Criteria for the National Highway System. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legisregs/nhsdatoc.html>)

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conversion, "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and

Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual," 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965. (www.ceres.ca.gov, www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996. (www.qp.gov.bc.ca)

County of San Diego Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance, 1994, Title 6, Division 3, Ch. 4. Sections 63.401-63.408. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2002 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2002. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System. (www.nrcs.usda.gov, www.swcs.org).

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

AIR QUALITY

CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised November 1993. (www.aqmd.gov)

County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

BIOLOGY

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFG and California Resources Agency, Sacramento, California. 1993. (www.dfg.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, An Ordinance Amending the San Diego County Code to Establish a Process for Issuance of the Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat Loss Permits and Declaring the Urgency Thereof to Take Effect Immediately, Ordinance No. 8365. 1994, Title 8, Div 6, Ch. 1. Sections 86.101-86.105, 87.202.2. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Ord. Nos. 8845, 9246, 1998 (new series). (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Implementing Agreement by and between United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game and County of San Diego. County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, 1998.

County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Subarea Plan, 1997.

Holland, R.R. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California, 1986.

Memorandum of Understanding [Agreement Between United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), San Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association of San Diego County.

Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v County of Stanislaus (5th Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d 54]. (www.ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Laboratory. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987. (<http://www.wes.army.mil/>)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. America's wetlands: our vital link between land and water. Office of Water, Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds. EPA843-K-95-001. 1995b. (www.epa.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Consultation Handbook: Procedures for Conducting Consultation and Conference Activities Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1998. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Environmental Assessment and Land Protection Plan for the Vernal Pools Stewardship Project. Portland, Oregon. 1997.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Vernal Pools of Southern California Recovery Plan. U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Region One, Portland, Oregon, 1998. (ecos.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002. (migratorybirds.fws.gov)

CULTURAL RESOURCES

California Health & Safety Code. §18950-18961, State Historic Building Code. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097-5097.6, Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic Sites. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

City of San Diego. Paleontological Guidelines. (revised) August 1998.

County of San Diego, Local Register of Historical Resources (Ordinance 9493), 2002. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Demere, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh. Paleontological Resources San Diego County. Department of Paleontology, San Diego Natural History Museum. 1994.

Moore, Ellen J. Fossil Mollusks of San Diego County. San Diego Society of Natural history. Occasional; Paper 15. 1968.

U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

GEOLOGY & SOILS

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Land and Water Quality Division, February 2002. On-site Wastewater Systems (Septic Systems): Permitting Process and Design Criteria. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Natural Resource Inventory, Section 3, Geology.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

American Planning Association, Zoning News, "Saving Homes from Wildfires: Regulating the Home Ignition Zone," May 2001.

California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements,

Chapter 16 Section 162. (www.buildersbook.com)

California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services Act. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998. (www.dtsc.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Consolidated Fire Code Health and Safety Code §13869.7, including Ordinances of the 17 Fire Protection Districts as Ratified by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, First Edition, October 17, 2001 and Amendments to the Fire Code portion of the State Building Standards Code, 1998 Edition.

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health Community Health Division Vector Surveillance and Control. Annual Report for Calendar Year 2002. March 2003. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov>, www.oes.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 5, CH. 3, Section 35.39100.030, Wildland/Urban Interface Ordinance, Ord. No.9111, 2000. (www.amlegal.com)

Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act as amended October 30, 2000, US Code, Title 42, Chapter 68, 5121, et seq. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Emergency Plan, March 2000.

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Energy Shortage Response Plan, June 1995.

Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)

Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western Fire Chiefs Association and the International Conference of Building Officials, and the National Fire Protection Association Standards 13 &13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R, 1996 Edition. (www.buildersbook.com)

HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report Number 476 Non-point Source Pollution: A Handbook for Local Government

California Department of Water Resources, California Water Plan Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources State of California. 1998. (rubicon.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, California's Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003. (www.groundwater.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000. (www.dpla2.water.ca.gov)

California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, § 8680-8692. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES General Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES (97-03-DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction Activities (No. 99-08-DWQ) (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.

California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinance, Title 8, Division 7, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and Watercourses. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov, <http://www.amlegal.com/>.)

County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002. (www.projectcleanwater.org)

County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance, Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7, Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances and amendments. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68. Diego Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined Floodways. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972, Title 33, Ch.26, Sub-Ch.1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1979.

Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United States Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220, 1991.

National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. (www.fema.gov)

National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994. (www.fema.gov)

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water Code Division 7. Water Quality. (ceres.ca.gov)

San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997. (www.sandag.org)

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108758. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

LAND USE & PLANNING

California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Open File Report 96-04, Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production Consumption Region, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)

California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code 21000-21178; California Code of Regulations, Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Appendix G, Title 14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California General Plan Glossary of Terms, 2001. (ceres.ca.gov)

California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51, California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures, January 2000. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84: Project Facility. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted and amended from September 29, 1971 to April 5, 2000. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego. Resource Protection Ordinance, compilation of Ord.Nos. 7968, 7739, 7685 and 7631. 1991.

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

Guide to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by Michael H. Remy, Tina A. Thomas, James G. Moore, and Whitman F. Manley, Point Arena, CA: Solano Press Books, 1999. (ceres.ca.gov)

MINERAL RESOURCES

National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42, 36.401 et. seq. 1969. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Subdivision Map Act, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Geologic Survey, Causey, J. Douglas, 1998, MAS/MILS Mineral Location Database.

U.S. Geologic Survey, Frank, David G., 1999, (MRDS) Mineral Resource Data System.

NOISE

California State Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, CCR, Appendix Chapter 3, Sound Transmission Control, 1988. . (www.buildersbook.com)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 6, Chapter 4, Noise Abatement and Control, effective February 4, 1982. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego General Plan, Part VIII, Noise Element, effective December 17, 1980. (ceres.ca.gov)

Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Planning (revised January 18, 1985). (<http://www.access.gpo.gov/>)

Harris Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, April 1995. (<http://ntl.bts.gov/data/rail05/rail05.html>)

International Standard Organization (ISO), ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747. (www.iso.ch)

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Environment and Planning, Noise and Air Quality Branch. "Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance," Washington, D.C., June 1995. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/>)

POPULATION & HOUSING

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, 42 USC 5309, Title 42--The Public Health And Welfare, Chapter 69--Community Development, United States Congress, August 22, 1974. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

National Housing Act (Cranston-Gonzales), Title 12, Ch. 13. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

San Diego Association of Governments Population and Housing Estimates, November 2000. (www.sandag.org)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000. (<http://www.census.gov/>)

RECREATION

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Division 10, Chapter PLDO, §810.101 et seq. Park Lands Dedication Ordinance. (www.amlegal.com)

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, January 2002.

California Department of Transportation, Environmental Program Environmental Engineering – Noise, Air Quality, and Hazardous Waste Management Office. "Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction and Reconstruction Projects," October 1998. (www.dot.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Street and Highways Code. California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Alternative Fee Schedules with Pass-By Trips Addendum to Transportation Impact Fee Reports, March 2005.

(<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/dpw/land/pdf/TransImpactFee/attacha.pdf>)

County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Report. January 2005. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Fallbrook & Ramona Transportation Impact Fee Report, County of San Diego, January 2005. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Office of Planning, Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report, April 1995.

San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. (www.sandag.org)

San Diego Association of Governments, Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Borrego Valley Airport (1986), Brown Field (1995), Fallbrook Community Airpark (1991), Gillespie Field (1989), McClellan-Palomar Airport (1994). (www.sandag.org)

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77. (www.gpoaccess.gov)

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural Resources Division, CIWMB Division 7; and Title 27, Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste. (ccr.oal.ca.gov)

California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management, Sections 40000-41956. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78: Small Wastewater. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Annex T Emergency Water Contingencies, October 1992. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973.

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77.

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.